

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1089

rien, and Tehuantepec. All of this was more than four centuries ago.

Long before the North American Revolution and the wars of liberation in Latin America, the idea of an isthmian canal had become an ancient historical conception, familiar to many leaders of the Western Hemisphere. No better expression of its significance can be found than that of Simón Bolívar, who, in 1815, declared: "That magnificent portion (of America), situated between the two oceans, will in time become the emporium of the universe. Its canals will shorten the distances of the world, and will strengthen the commercial ties of Europe, America, and Asia."

VALEDICTORY

Finally, fellow students, many of you here today are looking forward to the time of your graduation and pondering whether the future will offer you challenging opportunities. I say to you that there is no limit to such opportunities, but they will come only to those who are prepared to seize them and are willing to accept the inevitable responsibilities involved.

REMARKS OF JULIA DORSEY REED ON UNVEILING OF BUST OF CAPTAIN DUVAL

Members of the faculty, special guests, and students of Woodrow Wilson High School, in the original arrangements for today's student assembly, it was planned for Ross R. Williams, of Winsted, Conn., the sculptor and donor of the bust of our speaker, to address us and to unveil his own creation. Unfortunately, serious illness in his family has prevented him from leaving his home and he has requested me to act for him.

Who is Mr. Williams? A native of Philadelphia, Pa., with southern ancestral lines, he is a graduate of the Wharton School of Finance, University of Pennsylvania. Entering the Navy during World War II as a young officer, he was eventually assigned to the Canal Zone at Balboa and worked closely with our speaker during the time the latter was making some of his important researches on the operational problems of the Panama Canal.

Highly gifted in sculpture, Mr. Williams, found the head and face of our speaker as offering a challenge for portrayal. Starting on his task in his spare time early January 1944, he completed the bust in March, almost at the same time that Captain DuVal was finishing his basic canal studies. These facts make the bust a unique gift with historical significance for which, on behalf of the Woodrow Wilson High School, I express our fullest appreciation.

Leaving the service after the war, Mr. Williams entered business in New York and founded the R. R. Williams Co. of which he was president, and later relocated in Connecticut. He has been widely hailed as a worthy subject for a modern Horatio Alger.

On behalf of the sculptor, Ross R. Williams, of Connecticut, I now unveil the bust of our distinguished alumnus.

CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I address myself, briefly, to a matter that seems to me at this hour to be of genuine urgency. This is the security of this hemisphere.

No matter what the President may have said, or his brother for that matter, it requires no Senate or House investigation to realize that without inspection we do not know what missiles have been

removed from Cuba. Nor, for that matter, do we know what has been brought to the island since the so-called blockade was lifted. Nor, while I am on the subject, did we actually board and search any Communist vessels while conditions of quarantine were imposed.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the existing situation in Cuba is intolerable from any American point of view. Until we take a look—and keep looking—on the ground and underground in Cuba, not merely by aerial surveillance, we cannot and do not know the actual potential to harm our people that exists in Cuba.

I have long urged that our foreign policy should once again invoke the Monroe Doctrine with teeth in it. Atomic destruction can be launched from MIG's not alone from guided missiles. Even were we to assume that the Communist ego-maniac who now professes to head Cuba were never to launch an atomic weapon, the existence in Cuba of enemy airforces and Soviet submarine technicians constitutes aggression in this hemisphere. The island is so close to our shores that detection of even low-flying aircraft carrying horribly destructive weapons would lack those precious minutes needed to scramble our own Air Force to the air.

Mr. Speaker, we have just got to take a look in Cuba—and keep looking. Not the United Nations, but the United States and the United States unilaterally if need be.

Our very survival may depend upon this—not to mention the respect of the rest of the free world.

I do not understand what manner of influence within the executive branch of our Government, be its source the Department of State or otherwise, has caused this Nation to allow a Communist squatter tyrant to bulldoze the United States, to imprison our citizens, to kill and enslave innocent peoples, to establish a military potential against our country on our soft underside, astride the Panama Canal, and all as open agent of an enemy power that seeks to destroy the United States.

Can it be that some who have the President's ear continue to tell him that if we are nice to Communists they will be nice to us? What nonsense is this? What sheer folly for America.

Yet we know that at a time when the President knew full well that we were moving toward decisive action in Cuba he went to Indiana and in a political speech attacked Senator Homer Capehart for urging the very same thing. Is there no limit to political chicanery? Mr. Speaker, this is a tremendously serious matter. Security does not lend itself to partisan politics.

We must not allow the U.S.S.R. to further exploit the military advantage of Cuba's geographical location. Firmness is sorely needed now—for ourselves and for our children to follow us.

In the name of honor, of principle, of commonsense, of national security, of territorial integrity, Mr. Speaker, let us be on with what we know has to be done in Cuba. Let us demand immediate and continuing ground inspection by the

United States. If refused, let us achieve this necessary protection by force if need must be.

Above all, let there be an end to this administration's practice of playing politics with America's survival.

U.S. PORTS SHOULD BE CLOSED TO ALLIED SHIPPERS TRADING WITH CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during the closing days of the 87th Congress we were all alarmed at the intensified Soviet buildup which was underway in Cuba. On September 20, 1962, I urged that the United States take affirmative action in dealing with those allies shipping to Cuba by closing U.S. ports to them. Shortly after the date of my request, I was gratified to see the State Department announcement that plans were underway to close U.S. ports to free world shipping interests engaged in Cuban haulage, and that my recommendation prohibiting American goods much as Public Law 480 surplus foods would not be allowed as cargo on these vessels. It was understood at the time the announcement was made that the port ban would go into effect in a matter of weeks. Then Congress adjourned. Now, some 3 months later, the State Department advises me that action on this plan has not yet been taken.

The events which followed during the missile crisis this past fall gave proof that the United States was determined to hold a firm policy on Cuba. These same events also created serious hazards for any shipping in Cuban waters, and this traffic diminished.

However, recent reports are that there may be another Soviet buildup in Cuba. Since November 20, the date of the U.S. naval blockade was lifted, more than 30 Communist-bloc ships have arrived in Cuba to unload cargo. Furthermore, I am advised that some 20 ships from outside the Communist bloc also delivered cargo to Cuba during the period from November 20 to December 15. Mr. Speaker, this represents a period of not quite 4 weeks in which the number of Allied vessels trading in Cuba equals 40 percent of the total.

During the last weeks of the Congress an investigation into the general problem of free world shipping to Cuba was held by the House Select Committee on Export Control. That investigation yielded a direct relation between Allied shipping to Cuba and the transformation of that island into a military base by the Soviet Union. The Communist merchant fleet is limited in size. By chartering Allied hulls for nonmilitary shipments, the Soviets were thus able to assume the total burden of militarization themselves. This same principle applies now.

The crisis which the President thrust before the world on October 22, 1962, when he moved to protect the security

of this hemisphere served not only to impress the Soviets with the seriousness of U.S. intentions, but impressed the rest of the world as well. Almost overnight those Latin American nations who were our true allies came quickly to support this Nation. They realized that the presence of Soviet equipment in this hemisphere a serious threat to their security as well as ours. Now that our Latin American neighbors have seen the treachery of the Communists, I am hopeful that measures will be taken in the Organization of American States to further isolate Castro with economic boycott and other forms of separation from our community of nations.

I further hope that those nations in other parts of the world will support the United States in its efforts to isolate Castro. Hopefully, there will be no repetition of last year, when our friends tainted our friendship for cargo fees which amounted to not more than 1 percent of the total world's shipping.

Mr. Speaker, the United States should act now to close its ports to any shipping engaged in traffic with Cuba. Not only would such action serve to remind the world that the United States has not altered its previous position, but denying these ports would further prohibit American cargoes from financing part of the voyage.

In addition, barring U.S. ports to Cuban trade vessels would deny them Public Law 480 cargoes. There is no justification for U.S. taxpayers supporting any vessel which traffics with Cuba. Each year the United States generates exports of millions of dollars worth of subsidized surplus foods. In fiscal year 1962 the U.S. Government exported \$1.5 billion worth of these foodstuffs. The total amount of Public Law 480 exports equals \$9.1 billion since the program was started some 8 years ago. Mr. Speaker, as you can see, these exports represent a sizable amount of business for the world's shipping interests.

I am informed that the plan for closing U.S. ports has been completed, and is at this moment awaiting Presidential approval before being put into action. I urge that this approval be given as soon as possible in order that this long overdue ban may finally be imposed.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. HALEY. I have just listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman who just spoke about the situation in Cuba. The situation is bad in Cuba. I think this Congress or some committee of the Congress should thoroughly go into the situation down there because I think there still are missile bases in Cuba. Mr. Speaker, the time to have taken drastic action and firm action in Cuba was in 1958 when certain people in our country were bringing and the news media of this country were bringing Castro to power. They had ample warning at that time as to what the situation was. So I say, Mr. Speaker, the time to have taken action in Cuba was in 1958, 1959 or 1960 or

1961 before great powers became involved in the Cuba situation. We gave Cuba her freedom. Therefore, she, in a way is our child, and we are more or less responsible for that child. So we should have taken action at that particular time. If we had done so, we would not be having this deplorable situation that we have today. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's suggestion that the time to have acted was in 1958 and 1959 undoubtedly was intended to leave the impression that responsibility for the situation in Cuba should be placed on another administration than the one presently in power. This subject of national security should be bipartisan, but the hour is late. We all know that although when we had cancer of a toe we might have stopped its further spread by excision, but did not. Were it then to spread to the ankle, and then threaten our knee—if before that time we know that life can be saved only by a drastic operation at the hip—we know what has to be done. We must operate.

The situation down in Cuba has degenerated to the point where we are all deeply concerned as to the nature of the operation that is needed to cure it. We cannot afford to ignore it or turn the other cheek. The Armed Forces are deeply concerned. So are our people and they would be more so if they were fully informed. We must inspect.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, let me say to my distinguished friend from New Hampshire that the delegation from Florida in 1958 tried to warn this House of what was happening. We did likewise in 1959, in 1960, and again in 1961. I do not lay this on anybody's doorstep; I say that the American Congress and the American President who has the facilities to gather information should have known what was going on and should have alerted the American people and us. All one had to do was to see who that bearded delinquent down there had around him to know what the eventual outcome of the situation would be in Cuba. Despite our warnings and efforts no action was taken by the Congress or the President. I again say that we ought to take action before more powers are involved.

Today the gentleman is well aware of the fact a move by this country into Cuba could well bring on world war III. Is that what the gentleman is advocating now?

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the gentleman from Florida suggests in the way of a present course of action, but it is certain that the very security and future of this country is imperiled unless we can inspect the island of Cuba and keep it under continuing inspection. If we do not inspect the island of Cuba and maintain such a careful continuing inspection, our fu-

ture is imperiled. It is something which is absolutely essential for our own survival. If we do not do this now we mortgage the future of all of our plans and operations. I suggest that the course of action which I have today recommended is sound. It is constructive. It is not territorial acquisition but merely continuing physical onsite inspection. The hour is late. It is no answer to say that certain great powers or certain great risks are involved. We must insist upon inspection now—facing as we are, a rapidly deteriorating situation in Cuba. Such firmness will not mean war—but continued American weakness surely will.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I may say we must take steps that can bring positive results. We would all like to do certain things. Of course risk is involved. But I do think closing American ports can bring positive action, something we can do and bring about some real results immediately.

TALKING BOOKS PROGRAM EXTENDED TO QUADRIPLIGICS AND THE NEAR BLIND

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. BATTIN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest programs of the Federal Government in cooperation with our State governments is the talking books program. Under this program, blind persons are able to be entertained, informed, and educated. For the Federal Government, this program is administered by the Library of Congress Division for the Blind.

Last year I introduced a bill to extend this service to persons who have lost the use of or lost all four limbs. This would afford such persons, who must be immobile in many cases, the advantages of keeping up to date on our literature, of learning more about current events, and of being entertained by books new and old. The Library of Congress, in reporting to the House Administration Committee, was generally favorable to my bill, although there was a recommendation from the Division for the Blind that it might also include persons who are not totally blind but who are unable to see well enough to read.

This suggestion has much merit, but there is also the difficulty of determining just where to draw the line for purposes of legislation. Through its chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURLESON), the House Administration Committee has asked the National Institutes of Health to draw up such guidelines as necessary. Work is going forward in this regard.

Interest in extending the talking book program has also been shown in the other body, especially by the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER). In the last Congress, he introduced legislation to extend this program to persons who have lost the use of both arms.

I am today introducing a new bill to extend the talking books program to include both persons who have lost the

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1091

use of all four limbs or have lost all four limbs—quadriplegics—and to persons who have sight defects and are unable to see well enough to read. A precise definition and guidelines in the latter group will have to await a completion of studies by the National Institutes of Health.

I have been most encouraged by the interest shown by the chairman of the House Administration Committee and by members of the committee. I am hopeful that a meeting of minds will be possible and that the talking books program may be extended to other persons who have a real need for it.

Under the talking books program, the Federal Government provides record players for the homes of the blind. Blind persons then periodically select books which they want to "read" and records are sent to them containing recordings of someone reading the books aloud. The distribution is carried out by State and private nonprofit groups. Under this program, the blind are able to "read" new books and old favorites, and relatives and friends are relieved of the duty of reading aloud.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Mr. SNYDER (at the request of Mr. BATTIN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofor granted to extend my remarks, I wish today to address myself to a matter which is of much concern to me.

Since my election on November 6, 1962, I have found the various agencies and departments of the U.S. Government to be most cooperative and helpful to me in my endeavor to understand the great problems that confront the world today and in my effort to be of service to my constituents in the Third Congressional District of Kentucky. There has been only one exception to this that I consider to be of sufficient concern to merit the attention of this body. And in this connection let me say that this is not an endeavor on my part to change the decision of the department involved, but merely an endeavor to get the facts upon which that decision was based so that I might report to my people. This is not a matter of national security. There is absolutely no reason why the facts upon which the decision was based should not be given to the duly elected U.S. Representative of the area involved.

Mr. Speaker, on November 21, 1962, I wrote to the Post Office Department in Cincinnati asking that they furnish me with a résumé of the facts in regard to the location of a branch post office known as the Iroquois station in south Louisville. That letter was answered on November 27 but no résumé of the facts was given and I was advised by that letter signed by Mr. R. D. Dyson that no decision had been made in regard to the location of that branch. Thereafter I received a good many phone calls and was advised by letter of the action of the Beechmont Civic Club wherein they went on record as opposing the removal of the Iroquois branch post office from its present location to another area. I do not

know whether the post office should be moved or not, and even with the facts, will not be able to say because I am not an expert in this field.

As a result, on November 29, I again wrote Mr. Dyson in Cincinnati and requested that I be permitted to examine the file on this matter either in Washington or Louisville and gave him my schedule at both places. On December 6, I received a letter from Mr. Dyson's secretary advising me that Mr. Dyson was out of town and would return on December 10, at which time my letter would be referred to him. That letter remained unanswered and on or about December 21, I was advised by the people in the area of the Iroquois post office branch that a decision had been made to move the post office. On December 21, I wrote again to Mr. Dyson, pointing out that my letter of November 29 remained unanswered; that he had not extended to me the courtesy of advising me that they had reached a decision in this matter and that I still desired the facts so that I could report back to the Beechmont Civic Club and the other people involved. On January 2, I received a letter from Mr. J. P. Nolan, Regional Director of the Post Office Department in Cincinnati, indicating that he was advising his assistant that I desired to talk to him about this matter. I still have not heard from the assistant despite the fact that on January 7, 1963, I wrote to Mr. Nolan with a copy of that letter to Mr. Fred Belen, the Assistant Postmaster General, wherein I reiterated the fact that I was not trying to influence anyone's decision, but only wanted the facts so that I could respond to the people of my district and furnish them with the Post Office Department's alleged justification for the move.

Mr. Speaker, it has now been 21 days since my January 7 letter and it has been a month and a half since the Post Office Department's decision, and I still do not have any information to furnish to the people of my district, nor has Mr. Nolan or Mr. Belen replied to my letter of January 7. I wish to state here and now that if the Members of Congress are to be of service to their constituents, then the Post Office Department will have to be as cooperative as the rest of the departments of the Government are. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Post Office Department might consider the fact that they, like we, of this House, are employees of the people and are servants of the taxpayers and that this hoax called civil service does not render them immune from the duty to respond to the inquiries of taxpayers and their duly elected representatives.

(Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. BATTIN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. CURTIS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

QUESTIONS ARE GOING TO BE ASKED

(Mr. JOHANSEN (at the request of Mr. BATTIN) was given permission to ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, one way or another, questions are going to be asked—sharp, prying, relentless, embarrassing questions. They are going to be asked in this session of Congress, by Democrats and Republicans alike, about Cuba, about the incredible blunders under both administrations, about where we now stand, and about the dangers ahead.

These questions may be asked in House or Senate hearings specifically authorized for that purpose. They may be asked of top, key officials during routine appearances before committees of Congress. They may be asked in House or Senate floor debate. But they are going to be asked. And they had better be answered—frankly, fully truthfully. The American people are entitled to those answers if for no other reason than the fact that they have been greatly imposed upon.

They were misled and lulled into accepting Castro as non-Communist.

They were shamed by the Bay of Pigs blunder and by the ransom methods used to redeem the captives and relieve some guilty consciences.

They are disgusted by the hypocrisy of the Attorney General who recently praised the President for taking the responsibility for the failure and, in the next breath alibied, "The President inherited people with major reputations and he accepted their advice."

They are disillusioned, after the momentary October 22 posture of courage and boldness, by the willingness to offer a no-invasion pledge and the failure to hold out for on-site inspection.

They know the President has abandoned the Monroe Doctrine.

A vengeful, righteous, public wrath would be sufficient reason why there should be questions—and answers.

But there is an infinitely more important reason. The overriding necessity for a thorough investigation relates, not to past blunders, but to present and prospective perils, and our will and capacity and plans to deal with those perils.

I have been told that the Nation was only 12 days from disaster at the time of the October nuclear buildup. How did we come that close to catastrophe? What lessons have we learned and are we applying to assure that this—or worse—does not happen again?

The Attorney General has acknowledged that Cuba "poses a great danger" as a base for subversion and sabotage throughout the hemisphere. What plans or programs have we for eliminating that activity and that base?

Currently there are reports of a new military buildup in Cuba, with the admitted continued presence there of Soviet troops. Or perhaps those troops have now reverted to the status of "technicians." Are congressional efforts to get the facts about these reports going to receive the same bureaucratic brushoff similar inquiries received prior to October 22?

The answers to these and other equally urgent questions will, of necessity, involve a post mortem on past blunders

and the whole sordid story which began with the hasty recognition of Castro's regime.

But not just for the sake of conducting a post mortem.

If we persist in blundering along in this life-and-death struggle, we can come to the ultimate blunder and the ultimate defeat. If that occurs there will be no one to conduct the final post mortem except the victorious enemy—and he will have no need for it.

THE KAISER STEEL CORPORATION AND THE UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA

(Mr. SHEPPARD (at the request of Mr. STEPHENS) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues an event that took place in my district in California that may well open a new era in labor-management relations in this country.

I refer to the action taken by Kaiser Steel Corp., and the United Steelworkers of America in recommending a long-range sharing plan to the employees of Kaiser Steel. The plan is designed to do away with the threat of strikes every 2 or 3 years on economic issues of wages or benefits. It is also designed to protect employees against job loss or income loss because of automation. I am able to report that the plan was voted on by employees on January 11 and accepted by a three to one majority. The plan will go into effect March 1, 1963.

If I may say so, acceptance of such a plan by the employees, the company, and the union is encouraging in a land too often turbulent with industrial uncertainties, disruption of production, and economic harm to families and companies throughout the Nation. It should encourage us to keep searching for similar solutions to industrial unrest, whether arising on the waterfront, in the factory or business house, and particularly in defense or defense-related programs.

My interest in Kaiser Steel and its steelworker employees goes back to the early days of World War II when I was privileged to help Henry J. Kaiser locate his steel plant at Fontana, Calif. It was wartime and the West needed steel for ships. Mr. Kaiser had started building ships on San Francisco Bay, first because the British were losing ships faster than they could get them, and then because the United States got into the war.

The Government said any new defense plant must be located at least 60 miles inland, and I knew that Fontana had much to offer. It was rural. There was room. There were three railroads—Southern Pacific, Santa Fe, and Union Pacific. There were people. Even with the surrounding towns, though, there were not enough people. Kaiser Steel hired everybody who could do anything. Kaiser Steel went back east to Pittsburgh and other steel centers and hired others with know-how who wanted to try mixing orange groves and steelmaking.

What this huge facility has done for the Fontana area can be indicated by a few figures. The gross payroll paid to employees in some 15 surrounding communities came to \$60 million in 1962. Approximately 8,000 workers at Fontana share in this payroll.

By war's end, the plant had produced over half a million tons of plate for vitally needed ships, steel for artillery shells, and steel for our allies. Postwar, the plant expanded rapidly. The initial \$50 million war facility grew into today's half-billion-dollar enterprise, now serving the needs of the growing West from its 3-million-ton-ingot capacity.

The sharing plan I call to your attention today is another testimony to the vigorous approach of the Kaiser organization in solving problems wherever they occur—whether in production or in the vital area of industrial relations.

After the disastrous 1959 steel strike, Edgar F. Kaiser, chairman of the board of Kaiser Steel Corp., and David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, determined to find a solution to this ever recurring problem. As Mr. Kaiser said then:

The necessity of revising the present system of adjusting individual income under union contracts is obvious. All parties are injured economically by strikes. Relations between labor and industry are strained during the periods of negotiations. The interests of the public, labor, and the companies are the same. The answer is neither obvious nor easy. It is our common duty to find one.

Agreement was reached by the two leaders and the employees of Kaiser Steel returned to work under terms of a contract that contained a revolutionary idea in the area of modern labor-management relations. Representatives of the public were invited to form a tripartite committee made up of three company, three union, and three public members. Purpose of this committee was to establish a long-range plan for equitable sharing of the company's progress among stockholders, the employees, and the public. The plan was to eliminate drawn-out negotiations and the threat of strike deadlines over wages and benefits that plagued the industry in the past. The plan was also to provide protection to employees against loss of employment or income because of automation or new technologies.

The committee is chairmanned by Dr. George W. Taylor, professor at the University of Pennsylvania. He is assisted by public members David L. Cole and Dr. John T. Dunlop. All three of these eminent citizens are well known to Congress for their many years of service on Presidential committees.

Assisting Mr. McDonald was Arthur J. Goldberg, now a member of the Supreme Court, whose place is now taken by Marvin J. Miller, special assistant to Mr. McDonald, and Charles J. Smith, director of the west coast area for the United Steelworkers. Assisting Mr. Kaiser are E. E. Trefethen, Jr., vice chairman of the board, and C. F. Borden, executive vice president for Kaiser Steel Corp.

First, let me relate the practical bene-

fits provided employees, the company, and the public as envisioned under the plan.

The employees have been put on a "get paid as you earn" basis, similar to the Government's "pay as you go" tax plan. Employees do not have to wait 2 or 3 years for productivity or other determinations to be made before receiving wage or benefit increases, always with the ever-impending threat of strike or lockout. Under the plan, productivity and any other efforts of employees to reduce manufacturing costs are measured monthly. Employees are paid 32.5 percent of such savings in the form of extra pay each month.

Also, employee jobs and employee income are protected by establishment of an employment reserve or pool where employees displaced by automation are engaged until assigned to another appropriate job.

Both of these radical changes are being made without destroying seniority or other rights bargained for under the existing contract.

As to benefits for the public—the public is freed from the effects of strikes or lockouts suffered in breakdowns of previous negotiations. It gets the benefits, direct and indirect, that will result from the efforts of the employees and the company to reduce costs and keep steel prices competitive with those of both domestic and foreign competitors. The public also benefits from increased taxes made possible by such internal savings generated in reducing costs.

The company and stockholders, of course, directly benefit from the cooperative efforts of all to reduce costs and maintain a better position competitively; from the company's ability to install with the cooperation of employees and the union the best of technological improvements and automation; and from the company's ability to plan ahead for customers and community alike without concern for strikes or lockouts. These are the general benefits envisioned by the plan.

More importantly to the broad picture, the plan has purposes that go beyond the equitable sharing of economic progress made by the company, and such important matters as employment and income security for employees. It also concerns itself over the matter of survival of the bargaining rights of employees, of the survival of the bargaining freedom of companies and union organizations under the free enterprise system as we know it now.

In this regard, the invitation to have public members join the long-range committee in developing this plan was one of the most positive steps taken by industry and labor in recent years to help stop the growing tide of Government regulation that could well restrict employee freedoms, as well as the freedom of companies and unions to bargain. This tide was created more by the unawareness of industry, unions, and other associations of the increasing need to regulate themselves in the public interest than by any desire of the Government to do more regulating. In fact, the Government itself, as well as many other in-

ing about brushing his teeth. When do we leave?"

In short, 512-room Canyon Village, intended as a model in commercially developed lodgings for the entire park system, has turned out to be a failure, faulty in design, faulty in construction, with poor heating, flimsy soundproofing and a multitude of other shortcomings. Rooms are horribly overpriced (\$13.50 for two, \$18.50 for four), and the entire setting is incongruous with the great park, landscaped largely with black asphalt and blinking lights over the cocktail lounge. The gift shop offers one of the worst assortments of trinkets in America, 8,000 separate items, principally cheap, but profitable, importations from the Far East, including imitation English Wedgewood, Spanish toreador figurines in several colors, bells of Sarna and bongo drums.

The tragic debacle of Yellowstone illustrates the power exercised by private concessionaires. The three firms at Yellowstone appear to have more authority than the park superintendent. The Yellowstone Park Co., which operates lodgings and restaurants, made profits over the years while its plant became outmoded, overused and ill maintained. Finally goaded into construction of Canyon Village, the company paid \$5,500,000 for a project originally estimated at \$3,500,000. In an effort to recoup its losses, the firm last summer cut the number of college boys and girls on its payroll, then cut the wages of those it hired, to the barest minimum of compliance with wage-hour laws.

Yet for all the failings of the concessionaires, it remains for the park staff to answer the many complaints. The principal ones last summer were poor housekeeping, antiquated facilities, poor service, poor food.

Avoid the blight of Yellowstone? It is possible to a certain extent. You can find decent, clean and modern cabin and motel-type accommodations at the Grand Tetons, or well-kept campgrounds in surrounding areas. Look only at the thermal wonders, the wildlife and the marvels of a vast wilderness, shutting your eyes to all else.

But this is exactly the trouble: thinking Americans have shut their eyes for to long while blight and mass vulgarization have swept over the landscape. The amusement parks, the souvenir stands, the roadside animals won't go away by themselves. But neither must they be accepted as being here forever.

The point isn't that such places are not interesting or entertaining or even, in some cases, in good taste. But, rather, do they belong where they are? What does Mother Goose have to do with the commemoration of a Civil War battlefield? What are commercial biblical dioramas doing in the Great Smokies?

IT'S NEVER TOO LATE

"Honky-tonk, cheap-facade joints in the mountain areas are a disgrace to the State," declared a recent editorial in the Greensboro, (N.C.) Daily News, which pointed out what should be done. "Agitation in the public prints will do something to tidy up these roadside monstrosities. A little local or community pride might jolt the owners into at least partial recognition that an attractive, neatly kept roadside establishment is the best advertisement in the world for business."

Look over your own community. Demonstrate pride in its appearance and your desire to protect its inherent values. Sure, there's money in the tourist industry, but beauty is a far better advertisement for any town than a billboard. Certainly accommodations and commercial attractions are entitled to directional signs, but unrestrained coercive advertising of a captive audience is quite another thing.

Support the type of beautification work undertaken by the garden clubs, the true historic restoration urged by preservation groups, the strict zoning proposals. They will do far more to create a favorable image that visitors will remember, and that you can live with, than glimmerack attractions, high prices, and unrestrained signboards.

In going places with your family, be selective. Visit places of reputation and stature because they really interest you, not because of their repetitive advertising along the roadside. If you want to see animals, there are zoological gardens in major cities. For souvenirs, purchase craft items indigenous to the area, not some cheap trinket that will scarcely survive the trip home. Cultivate an appreciation of the best of America in your children.

When you're good and mad, write letters. To the President, about the tragedy of Gettysburg. To the Governor of the State where you feel any shrine is marred. To the Director of the National Park Service, about the shabbiness of Yellowstone or of national park souvenir counters. Letters to the editor of your daily newspaper are useful because other people see them, too. Tell about places you are not going back to visit a second time.

Such words will find their way around, and nothing will shake a tourist community more than realizing it may lose business. Perhaps nothing will do more to encourage it to enhance, instead of exploit, its endowment of history or natural wonders.

Resolution To Create a Select Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing a resolution to create a Select Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament in the House of Representatives. I had originally proposed the creation of such a committee during the last session of Congress, and hope that it will not be possible to obtain prompt consideration of the legislation during the current Congress.

This resolution provides that the committee would be composed of 13 Members of the House of Representatives chosen for their special knowledge of foreign affairs, armed services, atomic energy, science, and astronautics. The committee would be authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of proposals for arms control and disarmament including, but not limited to, first, efforts made by the United Nations in seeking the control and reduction of military forces and armament of all types; second, disarmament proposals developed by the United States and other governments as well as by private groups and individuals; third, methods by which the attitudes of the American people and their Government on the subject of disarmament and world peace may be communicated abroad; fourth, the relationship of armaments to the state of the world

economy; fifth, the relationship of underlying international tension to the problems of disarmament; sixth, the dangers implicit in unilateral reduction of armaments; and seventh, methods of assuring that plans for reduction of armaments shall not endanger the security of the United States.

I realize that any proposal to create another standing committee would probably meet with some difficulty and with much reluctance on the part of many Members of the House. Therefore I ask that a select committee be set up to stimulate discussion and consideration of one of the most pressing issues of the day—that of arms control and disarmament.

Creation of such a committee would be desirable and necessary first step to reduce the grave possibility of nuclear war, because it would emphasize the efforts being made by the United States in its current negotiations with the Soviet Union to end nuclear weapons tests. I think we have all been heartened by the recent exchanges between President Kennedy and Soviet Premier Khrushchev, and by the temporary halt in U.S. underground atomic tests, announced by the President the other day, which is another step in the direction of world peace. I fervently hope that the further discussions which are due to take place in New York this week will bring us even closer to an agreement on a nuclear test-ban treaty at the Geneva meetings next month. Establishment of such a committee would have a tremendous impact on world opinion, and would demonstrate for all to see that the Congress of the United States is completely in accord with the efforts of the President to reduce the possibility of thermonuclear war, which could destroy us all.

I certainly hope that this resolution will warrant the consideration and support of each and every Member of the House.

Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology on Cuba and Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, year before last, on May 23, 1961, I placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled, "A Selected Chronology on Cuba and Castro." The Library of Congress had prepared this for me, at my request, in order for me to keep the events taking place in Cuba in their proper sequence.

Since that time the Library of Congress has continued to keep this chronology up to date and I now wish to follow up my original action by placing the later continued story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix on 5 consecutive days, beginning today.

I am doing this because of the renewed controversy over who did what and who did not do what they should have with regard to our U.S. policy toward Cuba. Our Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, has made it a point to come up with some fairly myopic remarks during the course of an interview by the U.S. News & World Report on January 28, 1963, published under the title of "Robert Kennedy Speaks His Mind."

I used the word "myopic" because I feel his viewpoint is rather nearsighted, to say the least, as far as the Cuban issue is concerned. Let me quote a portion of his remarks to indicate why I feel this way:

Question. Do you feel that the latest Cuban crisis was a lesson to the Russians?

Answer. I think it makes a great difference because that's the first time that the power position and determination and energy of the American people and their Government—all of this had been brought to bear.

Now I suppose we cannot really blame Robert Kennedy for wanting his brother's administration to stand out as the one which singlehandedly solved the Cuban issue. However, a review of the chronology I previously inserted will prove that former President Eisenhower took, and attempted to take some steps which would have shown the power position and determination and energy of the American people and their Government. Attempts have repeatedly been made by many of those around the President to blame the Cuban problems on the Eisenhower administration. I feel the American people are entitled to something more than that sort of demagoguery. Space will not permit my quoting some of the actions taken by President Eisenhower, but again I commend the former chronology on Cuba to the Members and the public's attention.

While a candidate for the Presidency, then Senator Kennedy called the October 19, 1960, embargo on all exports to Cuba, with exception of medical supplies and various food products—placed by President Eisenhower—"a dramatic but almost empty gesture—a gesture which will have so little impact on Castro as to be almost meaningless." Yet President Kennedy on February 3, 1962, proclaimed an embargo on almost all U.S. trade with Cuba, with the exception "on humanitarian grounds" of the export to Cuba of certain foods and medicines. His feelings as President seem to be greatly different than his feelings as Candidate Kennedy.

Again, Candidate Kennedy on October 6, 1960, made a speech at a Democratic dinner in Cincinnati, Ohio. Exhibiting a detailed knowledge of Castro's attempts to carry his revolution through South America, Mr. Kennedy stated:

The American people want to know how this was permitted to happen—how the Iron Curtain could have advanced almost to our front yard. They want to know the truth—and I believe that they are entitled to the truth.

The American public for some time now has longed to know the truth about the failure of the Cuban invasion and our part in it. Statements made by Bobby

Kennedy, and backed by the President cover only the small issue of whether we promised air cover or not. But a statement by Manuel Penabaz, a veteran of the Cuban invasion, does not back up this supposed "official report."

Former President Eisenhower, by no means a man who could ever be called a demagog, stated on December 22, 1962 that he believed the truth is a far better weapon in his cold war against communism than managed news. He stated further that he has no reason to think the American people have not been told the truth on the Cuban situation, but he noted that he doesn't know all the facts. He stated further that he sees no reason why the administration should not now release a full and official version of what happened in the disastrous attempt to invade Cuba in April 1961. The Bay of Pigs invasion is now history, he said, and the official story should have been told long ago.

On April 24, 1961, Presidential Press Secretary Pierre Salinger declared in a statement to the press that President Kennedy "assumes sole responsibility for the U.S. role in the action against Cuba."

Yet on May 24, 1961, President Kennedy, in discussing the tractors-for-prisoners ransom demand of Castro, in which he declared the U.S. Government would not negotiate with Cuba to ransom the prisoners, stated:

these men were trained and armed for this invasion by the Eisenhower administration. The signal to let them go and the means to get them there were given by the Kennedy administration. The United States still has a responsibility for those lives.

Now, former President Eisenhower, on January 24, 1963 says no plan was drawn up during his administration for a U.S. air cover for a refugee invasion of Cuba. He added however that he had "no kick with the plan" for air cover for the invaders. "If that had been done," he added, "that might have made the difference, because once these forces were ashore, ready to take care of themselves, it might have been easy to get more reinforcements through from the island itself and, finally, to recognize a government there."

Is it any wonder that Members of Congress, the public, and the press would like a truly official report of what happened? The Congress, you will remember, took some pretty strong actions itself in passing resolutions and legislation aimed at solving the Cuban crisis. They took these actions because they were close to the American grassroots opinion. They knew the American public wanted something done, that it was tired of speeches and soothing words, promising action but taking none. Those who trouble to read the original chronology on Cuba and Castro and follow through my continued chronology, will refresh their memory on some of the events, as reported, on the Cuban situation. And perhaps the congressional investigations suggested and promised will make the official actions clear to the American public.

I believe we can depend upon the commonsense and good judgment of the

American people to know and recognize partisan politics when they see it played. And if the administration truly desires a bipartisan foreign policy and the continued support and encouragement of the American public and the Republican Party, it should remember that we do not intend that former President Eisenhower should be labeled directly or indirectly as a weakling by any member of the Cabinet, regardless of relationship to the President. This man, whose name has always been synonymous with honor, bravery, and love of his country, does not hesitate to call for support of the President's foreign policy. And he is not afraid of the truth or an "official version" of what took place on the Cuban issue.

Let me say that neither the Kennedy administration nor the minority party nor the majority party are doing themselves, or the public, justice if this matter is allowed to fall and rest in the area of purely partisan politics. The public, who gave the President complete, enthusiastic, and unequivocal support at the time he announced the "quarantine" of Cuba could well lose its enthusiasm for further support of this administration if they are denied the truth, or given half-truths or distortions.

And that is why I am including, Mr. Speaker, with my remarks today, a second portion, covering the period between May 20, 1961, through September 13, 1961, of the "Selected Chronology on Cuba and Castro," and every day hereafter a continuation of the chronology for a total of 5 consecutive days.

We want to keep the record straight.

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA AND CASTRO¹

May 20, 1961: A committee of U.S. citizens, headed by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Walter Reuther (president of the United Auto Workers), and Dr. Milton Eisenhower, is formed to raise the funds to provide the 500 tractors. "President Kennedy was reliably . . . reported to have personally asked three prominent private citizens . . . to organize the 'tractors-for-prisoners' exchange with Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba" (New York Times, May 24, 1961).

May 24, 1961: President Kennedy urges all Americans to contribute to the purchase of the 500 tractors.

June 2, 1961: Tractors for Freedom Committee informs Premier Castro that it is ready to send the 500 tractors in exchange for the 1,214 prisoners. The committee gives him until noon June 7 to accept the offer.

June 6, 1961: Premier Castro suggests that his prisoners be exchanged for "political prisoners" allegedly held in jail in the United States, Puerto Rico, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Spain. He also demands that Mrs. Roosevelt or Dr. Eisenhower, two of the leaders of the Tractors for Freedom Committee, come to Havana for further negotiations.

June 7, 1961: Cuban Government nationalized education.

June 8, 1961: Tractors for Freedom Committee offers to send six agricultural experts to Havana to discuss details of the types of tractors to be sent in exchange for the prisoners. The committee also announces that it is prepared to send the first consignment of 100 tractors to Cuba by June 22.

¹ Based chiefly on excerpts from Deadline Data; reproduced with the permission of Deadline Data on World Affairs.

Premier Castro accepts the offer the next day.

June 14, 1961: Experts confer with Premier Castro. He now demands tractors valued at \$28 million, the equivalent of 1,000 farm-type tractors or 500 heavy-duty construction tractors, and will exchange them for 1,167 prisoners instead of the 1,214 he had originally offered to trade. He explains that the difference is due to some fatalities, special trials he plans, and other reasons.

June 19, 1961: Tractors for Freedom Committee in Detroit cables reply to Premier Castro. They give him until noon June 23 to decide whether he will accept 500 farm-type light tractors in exchange for the 1,214 prisoners he originally offered to trade. If he refuses, the committee will return the funds it has collected to the contributors.

June 26, 1961: Adlai E. Stevenson, President Kennedy's special envoy to Latin America and U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., declares at the National Press Club in Washington that during his recent trip to Latin America, Cuban agents preceded or followed him for propaganda purposes.

June 28, 1961: Florida court orders seizure of 29 carloads of lard going to Cuba. "The seizure order was obtained by a Miami advertising firm to help satisfy a judgment of \$429,000 against the Cuban Government tourist agency" (New York Herald Tribune, July 6, 1961).

July 4, 1961: U.S. authorities in Florida seize three Cuban planes which have landed in the United States after being stolen from Cuba by refugees. The planes are seized on court orders to satisfy claims against the Cuban Government.

July 21, 1961: U.S. Government announces that it will finance the passage of 20,000 refugees from Cuba to the United States, because the refugees cannot obtain dollars.

July 23, 1961: Cuban Government orders Pan American World Airways—the company chartered by the U.S. Government for the airlift—to limit its flights from Miami to Havana to two round trips a day.

July 24, 1961: U.S. commercial airliner—worth \$3.5 million—en route from Miami to Tampa, Fla., is forced by an armed passenger to fly to Havana. The other passengers and the crew are returned to the United States the following day, but the plane is kept by the Cuban authorities.

July 26, 1961: Premier Castro, in a speech made at the 26th of July celebrations, declares that he will return the airliner if the United States returns "the 10 Cuban planes which it has stolen."

During a speech made at the celebration of the 8th anniversary of the 26th of July movement, Premier Castro announces that all Cuban political parties are eventually to be merged into the United Party of the Socialist Revolution. The celebrations are attended by Soviet Astronaut Maj. Yuri Gagarin.

July 27, 1961: U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk declares in Washington that the United States will not agree to the exchange. He declares that final authority for the return of Cuban planes to Cuba rests with the courts, and not with the U.S. Government, and that if it is entitled to do so, the Cuban Government may apply for "sovereign immunity" for the planes. Rusk points out that since mid-1959, 25 Cuban planes have been held in the United States. Some of these have been sold in pursuance of court orders.

July 29, 1961: Cuban note to the U.N. accuses the United States of preparing an "imminent military aggression" against Cuba, and of using the plane incident as an excuse for its plans. Foreign Minister Raul Roa announces that the Cuban Government has placed the U.S. plane under the jurisdiction of the U.N. Security Council. The U.S. State

Department declares that the Cuban move in the U.N. is a "transparent tactic to divert attention from the actions of the Castro government in detaining" the plane.

August 2, 1961: Government announces the reorganizing of the country's labor unions under direct government control. Henceforth, there will be only one union for each industry, and all unions will be grouped under a Workers' Confederation.

August 3, 1961: Two U.S. citizens—a former convict and his son—fall in a plot to take a Boeing 707 jet airliner to Cuba from El Paso, Tex.

August 4, 1961: Cuban government again protests to the U.N. Security Council that the U.S. Government is preparing military aggression against Cuba, and is using plane incidents as an excuse.

August 5, 1961: Cuban Government declares that it will release the airliner if the United States releases a Cuban patrol boat brought to Florida by defectors a week ago.

Cuban Government orders the immediate replacement of all Cuban currency. All bills now in circulation must be traded in for new ones. No more than 200 new pesos will be given any one household. Any amount over this will be deposited in a "special account" and may be drawn upon in a week's time. Bank holdings are not affected. There is no revaluation involved in the move. Cuban borders are closed to all ships and planes through August 7, to prevent any Cuban money being brought in from abroad.

August 8, 1961: Premier Castro declares that Cubans will be allowed to draw up to 1,000 pesos in cash from their special accounts. Thereafter, they will be allowed to withdraw at the rate of 100 pesos a month. Total deposits of 10,000 pesos will be allowed, but any amount over 5,000 will be placed into savings accounts. Castro also declares that any amount over 10,000 pesos will be confiscated.

Minister of Industry Ernesto Guevara (during a 2-hour speech, at the Inter-American Economic Conference in Punta del Este, Uruguay), accuses the United States of attempting the assassination of Armed Forces Minister Raul Castro on July 26, and of attempting the invasion of Cuba on the same day. He also implies that the United States was implicated in the assassination of President Trujillo of the Dominican Republic, on May 30. Guevara ridicules President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress, and declares: "While Cuba is there, the United States is ready to give." He suggests that with a little push, Latin America will get the \$30 billion in U.S. aid which Castro called for 2 years ago. Guevara declares that Cuba expects \$450,000 in loans from Communist countries over the next 4 years. Cuba, he says, "pledges a guarantee that it will not export revolution" to other Latin American countries. Guevara also produces two U.S. "secret" documents, allegedly State Department reports. The first characterizes Venezuelan officials as "inept and indifferent"; the second indicates the South American countries which can be counted upon for anti-Cuban measures.

August 9, 1961: U.S. Pan American jet airliner, en route from Mexico City to Guatemala, is forced by an armed passenger—a French Algerian, reportedly, a psychopath—to fly to Havana. The other passengers, the crew, and the plane are allowed to leave for Miami the same day. The Cuban Government declares that it is releasing the plane out of deference to the Colombian Foreign Minister, Julio Cesar Turbay Ayala, one of the passengers, and because Cuba is opposed to air piracy. In Washington, before it is known that the plane is returning to the United States on the same day, the news of the incident causes various U.S. Congressmen to advocate the use of force to retrieve the plane.

On the same day, Cuba requests the U.N. to place on the agenda of its 1961 General Assembly—due to open in September—an item on "threats to peace and security" by U.S. "aggression" against Cuba.

August 10, 1961: President Kennedy declares in a news conference that the anger aroused by the hijacking of planes must not be allowed to overshadow the importance of the Inter-American Economic Conference, meeting in Uruguay which he calls "perhaps one of the most significant meetings in the history of the Western Hemisphere."

August 14, 1961: The 5,805-ton *Bahia de Nipe*, a Cuban merchant ship carrying sugar and tobacco to a Soviet Baltic port, was seized by the captain and 10 crew members and diverted to Norfolk, Va.

August 15, 1961: A patrol boat, valued at \$50,000, which was brought to the United States on July 29, by Cuban defectors was returned to the Castro regime.

At the same time the Eastern Air Lines Electra hijacked on July 24 was returned to the United States by the Cuban Government.

August 21, 1961: President Kennedy declined to use the Cuban ship, *Bahia de Nipe*, as ransom for the families of the Cuban seamen who brought the ship here and have sought political asylum.

Earlier the Cuban Government formally asked for the return of the vessel and U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk asked a Federal court to release the ship.

August 24, 1961: In a special session of the U.N. General Assembly called to discuss the Bizerte dispute between France and Tunisia, the Cuban delegate challenged the validity of the treaty under which the United States maintains the Guantanamo Bay Naval Base. U.S. Ambassador Stevenson called Cuba's charge "international lawlessness."

August 29, 1961: Premier Castro called on the Brazilian people to "take arms * * * and take to the mountains and jungles" to fight the military leaders who are trying to keep Joao Goulart from becoming president of Brazil after the resignation of President Janio Quadros.

August 31, 1961: The Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin America said it was satisfied that an encounter in Montevideo, Uruguay, between Maj. Ernesto "Che" Guevara and Richard Goodwin, President Kennedy's Special Assistant on Latin American Affairs, was a casual and unimportant meeting at a cocktail party.

The subcommittee met with Mr. Goodwin after Argentina's Foreign Minister Adolfo Mugica declared on August 22 that the conversation had been politically vital and had touched on a possible resumption of United States-Cuban relations.

September 7, 1961: A spokesman for the Democratic Revolutionary Front, a Cuban exile group, announced that the front will shortly merge with the Revolutionary Council. The new group will be called the Cuban Revolutionary Council and will be headed by Miro Cardona with Antonio de Varona as second in command.

The U.S. Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals freed the hijacked freighter *Bahia de Nipe* for return to Cuba but stayed its order for 5 days to permit an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court.

September 9, 1961: Five of the prisoners captured after the unsuccessful invasion attempt last April were executed on charges of murder and torture committed before they left Cuba. Nine others were given 30-year jail sentences on similar charges.

September 10, 1961: Four thousand Cubans shouted antigovernment slogans in downtown Havana until they were dispersed by machinegun bullets. Seven were injured. The demonstration was touched off by cancellation of a Roman Catholic procession in honor of the Virgin of Charity, the patroness of Cuba.

September 13, 1961: A third request for an order blocking the immediate return of the freight *Bahia de Nipe* to Cuba was submitted to U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren by the United Fruit Co. which has claims against the freighter's cargo of sugar.

G. Gernon Brown—A Tribute to One of the Nation's Outstanding Molders of Men and Developers of Character in the Youth of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost one of its outstanding developers of character and molders of men in the unexpected death last week in New Orleans, of G. Gernon Brown, executive assistant director of the New Orleans Recreational Department and for more than two decades the football coach of the Jesuit High School in that city.

Gernon Brown was nationally known in the sports world and in the field of youth development.

Such All-American football players as Ki Mills, of Virginia Military Institute, and John Pettiborn, of Notre Dame, were developed by him.

To the big leagues in baseball he had sent "Tookie" Gilbert, Connie Ryan, Charlie Gilbert, "Fat" Dantoni, among others.

The affection held for him by the people of New Orleans is reflected in many tributes paid to him by press, radio, and television following his death.

Gernon Brown was my lifelong friend. We were boyhood companions and classmates from parochial school through our formative years at Jesuits in New Orleans during which time we were inseparable associates. It is not, however, because of this personal devotion to him that I pause to pay tribute to him today. It is because of the niche which he occupied in the community and the respect which he had earned as one of the most successful scholastic football coaches in the Nation.

I pay this tribute because I think it fitting and proper that something should be said at this time when an enduring recognition can be made of a man who has contributed so much to so many during his lifetime. Other communities undoubtedly have Gernon Browns in their midst. Other cities and other States have given birth to men of like stature who have never come into the national focus. I doubt, however, if there ever lived an individual who brought such eulogies from those among whom he lived and from those who knew him and profited by their association with him as did Gernon Brown.

His classmates borrowed from Shakespeare to say of him in the Blue Jay, the graduating classbook of 1920:

He was a man, take him all in all,
I shall not look upon his like again.

That was Gernon Brown.

How he kept that image in the years that followed is mirrored in what was written about him the day after he died.

Here is Charles L. "Pie" Dufour, columnist for the New Orleans States-Item and now an author of prominence with such books as "The Gentle Tiger," "The Night the War Was Lost," and "Nine Men in Grey," to his credit. It is an inspired tribute to the boy and to the man, written by one well qualified to write about his schoolmate and his friend. Dufour's column speaks eloquently for that segment who knew Gernon Brown as he lived and as he left his imprint on those who were privileged to have known him over a span of 30 years and more.

Here is "Pie" Dufour's tribute:

DEATH OF GERNON BROWN CREATES ANOTHER VOID IN NEW ORLEANS

(By Pie Dufour)

When a good man dies, there is a void in the world. Such a void has been created in New Orleans by the death yesterday of Gernon Brown.

Gernon—I use his first name, because we were friends for more than 45 years—was good in everything he did, everything he undertook.

As an individual, he was moral, ethical, honorable, a genuinely good man, cherished by friends and family.

Gernon Brown could have been a great actor. He was a great high school football and baseball coach. He could have been a great mathematician. He was a great math teacher.

But whatever he was, or could have been, he never failed to be a great human being. For here was a man with literally thousands of friends.

You'll read on the sports pages of his remarkable coaching career at Jesuit High, and in American Legion play and the records his teams compiled and the players he produced. But far beyond the records and the stars is Gernon Brown's influence for good on the boys he coached. Long after they, too, have forgotten what they did on the athletic field under Brown's tutelage, will remain the lessons in character that he instilled into them.

I was in the eighth grade at the old Jesuits on Baronne and Common when Gernon Brown was in first high. He was in the same class with Eddie Hébert, U.S. Representative from the First Congressional District. Just 6 months ago, Gernon was voted the Jesuit alumni Man of the Year Award, presented annually by Congressman Hébert.

Recently Charlie Wicker wrote about the old Jesuit team on which Gernon Brown played, and he quoted Eddie Hébert as saying that one year when the Blue Jays didn't have a coach, Gernon was player-coach. I challenged that in a conversation with Charlie, and he said that he had even checked it with Gernon, and that that was correct.

Well, that fact had escaped my memory entirely and just the other day, I wrote Congressman Hébert, chiding him on his memory playing tricks upon him. He came back in the same vein, insisting that he was right. I had intended calling Gernon Brown up to get the word from him. Just a few weeks earlier, Hébert had pointed out that Dan Levy, fullback on the old Blue Jay team in question had died within a few days of Dr. Joe Palermo, who once was a part-time Jesuit coach.

And now, a third member of those great Blue Jay days—the first of the great Jesuit teams—of 1919 and 1920, Gernon Brown, is gone.

As a fellow student of Gernon, I remember him as much for his histrionic ability as for his athletic prowess. He was really magnifi-

cent on the stage—a high school boy who could have stepped right onto the professional stage. I remember him as the jester in "In a Fool's Bauble," a play by whom, I know not, and he was great. But in his final year, 1920, Brown played the title role in Bulwer-Lytton's "Richelleu."

I've never forgotten Gernon's "Richelleu." I still hear him declaim: "Armand Duplessis, Duc de Richelleu dies not by the hand of man." Over the 43 years that have elapsed since Gernon played the famed cardinal of France—it was at the Lafayette Theater, now the Civic, I believe, but it could have been the old Tulane Theater—I would frequently greet him with that quote. I had good cause to remember, because I was a spear carrier in that production of "Richelleu," a companion warrior to Ellis Henican. We heard the play over and over in rehearsals, and grew quite familiar with other parts than our own. For, as I recall it, on the night of the play, we were so absorbed in Gernon's impressive performance that when the time came to do our military duty, we arrested the wrong character.

Had Gernon Brown gone on the stage, there is no doubt in my mind that he would have become one of the leading figures on the American stage. Instead, he went to Annapolis, but a broken leg as a plebe football player ended his naval career. He finished his education at Loyola.

A teaching post at Jesuit High, after graduation, led to his becoming an assistant coach under "Doc" Erskine. Judge Ike Carriere, then a young lawyer, taught and coached with Erskine part time. When he began to be too busy as a lawyer, he retired from this part-time coaching and teaching, and Brown took his place as a coach. When "Doc" Erskine went to Loyola as head coach, Gernon took over the Blue Jays. His more than two-decade performance was tremendous. For the last 10 years or so, Brown was the executive assistant director of NORD under 1-a-year-man Lester Lautenschlaeger.

Death came for him at his desk, yesterday. But wherever and whenever it had come, it would have found Gernon Brown ready. He was, in every finest sense of the word, a good man.

Here is Cro Duplantier, executive sports editor of the New Orleans States-Item whose facile pen describes the man and the memory he has left behind:

AS COACH SAID, HE'LL BE AROUND

(By Cro Duplantier)

Lester Lautenschlaeger, executive director of New Orleans Recreation Department, said G. Gernon Brown, New Orleans Recreation Department's assistant director, was completing a call made to set a luncheon date. "I'll be over in 10 minutes," Gernon said and hung up.

That was the last that Lester heard from Gernon and about the last thing anyone heard. For about 10 minutes later Gernon Brown was dead.

But the ending perhaps is a bit prophetic for Gernon will be over, he'll be around again, perhaps not in 10 minutes but time and time again in the minds and hearts of the thousands of boys grown into men whose lives he touched.

For when he touched the touch left an imprint—the G. Gernon imprint—and the mark has stayed with most of his boys forever after.

Gernon's own family life is indication enough of his attitude toward young people. He fathered 10 children and raised 9 of them. A man who raises nine children has to love children, has to love young adulthood, has to love people. And Gernon, for all his occasional gruffness, loved people.

We met Gernon the year he became a head coach. We were a boy of 11, he a vigorous, husky, impressive, assured man of 31.